DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 132 902 HE 008 441

TITLE	University of Illinois Employeees Job Satisfaction Study.
INSTITUTION	Illinois Univ., Champaign. Bureau of Institutional Research.
PUB DATE	Dec 74
NOTE	74p.; Some tables in Appendix may be marginally legible due to type size
AVAILABLE FROM	University of Illinois, University Bureau of Institutional Research, 409 East Chalmers, Champaign, Illinois
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Personnel; College Faculty; *Employee Attitudes; Employer Employee Relationship; *Employment Opportunities; *Higher Education; *Job Satisfaction; Nonprofessional Personnel; *Occupational Surveys; Professional Personnel; Promotion (Occupational); School Surveys; *Work Attitudes; Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS	University of Illinois Chicago Circle; University of Illinois Medical Center; University of Illinois Urbana Champaign

ABSTRACT

During the spring of 1974, 2,048 employees at the University of Illinois (976 at Urbana-Champaign, 490 at Chicago Circle, and 582 at Medical Center) were surveyed by mail and telephone to determine their degree of satisfaction with a number of job-related factors. Academic and nonacademic groups were represented. The results indicated that there are differences in the way the university's employees feel about their job situations. There are also distinctions in job satisfaction between academic and nonacademic employees and within each of these groups. Employees as a whole are well satisfied with the following factors: the work itself; co-workers; the feeling of being liked, respected, and needed; the boss; opportunities to use and improve one's skills and training; opportunities to control how the job is done; availability of needed supporting services, supplies, and equipment; and job-related information received. The lowest level of satisfaction involved: opportunities for promotion and promotional advancement; prospects for a comfortable retirement; earnings and prospects for financial security; and chances of bringing about needed changes in one's unit. (Author/LBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED132902

University of Illinois

Employees Job Satisfaction Study

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IR000441

REPORT PREPARED BY
UNIVERSITY BUREAU OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OFFICE OF PLANNING
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
DECEMBER, 1974

FOREWORD

The U. of I. Employees Job Satisfaction Study was under the general direction of Dr. Sandra A. Warden, an American Council on Education administrative intern on leave from Michigan State University, who was attached to the Office of President Corbally as a visiting professor. When Dr. Warden completed her one year appointment late in May of 1974, the data collection phase of the study still was in progress. This activity was completed by Survey Research Laboratory at the Urbana-Champaign Campus which had contracted to carry out the mail and telephone survey phases of the study. The present report has been prepared by the University Bureau of Institutional Research, a part of the University Office of Planning. Dr. Franklin L. Duff, Associate Director of the Bureau, was responsible for the writing of this report.

G. J. Froehlich, Director
UBIR

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	iii
I. Procedure	1
II. Results	5
III. Conclusions, Limitations and Recommendations	27
Appendix A: Questionnaire	31
Appendix B: Detailed Tables	36

ABSTRACT

During the Spring of 1974, 2,048 employees at the University --976 at Urbana-Champaign, 490 at Chicago Circle, and 582 at Medical Center -- were surveyed by mail and phone to determine their degree of satisfaction with a number of job-related factors. Nine groups of employees (four academic and five nonacademic) were represented in the sample.

The results of the survey study indicated that there are differences, both University-wide and among the three campuses, in the way the University's employees feel about their job situation. There also are distinctions in job satisfaction between academic and nonacademic employees and within each of these groups.

The University's employees as a whole are well satisfied with the following factors: the work itself; the co-workers; the feeling of being liked, respected, and needed; the boss; the opportunity to use and improve one's skills and training; the opportunity to control how the job is done; the availability of needed supporting services, supplies, and equipment; and the job-related information received. The lowest level of satisfaction centers around the following factors: the opportunity for promotion and professional advancement; the prospects for a comfortable retirement; the earnings and prospects for financial security; and the chances of bringing about needed changes in one's unit.

I. PROCEDURE

The University of Illinois Employees Job Satisfaction Study was initiated in early November of 1973 at the request of President Corbally. Designed to survey the attitudes of University of Illinois employees toward their jobs, the study used a five-page questionnaire (see copy in Appendix A) containing questions in the following areas:

(1) rating of a number of job-related factors compared to similar jobs in the field and to other jobs in the department;

(2) rating of co-workers and the boss;

(3) rating of adequacy of information received regarding employment at the University (retirement, insurance, fringe benefits, etc.);

(4) preference for working at the U. of I. and in the kind of job currently held;

(5) things that are best and least liked about working at the University; and

(6) things at the University that could be changed to make working conditions better.

The questionnaire was distributed by mail--beginning on April 15, 1974, at Urbana-Champaign and on May 5, 1974, at Chicago Circle and the Medical Center--to a random sampling of University employees in each of the following nine employee groups:

Academic Staff:	1. Tenured Faculty
	2. Non-tenured Faculty
	3. Professionals
	4. Graduate Assistants
Nonacademic Staff:	5. Officials and Managers
	6. Professional and Technical
	7. Office and Clerical
	8. Skilled, Semi-skilled, and Unskilled
	9. Service Workers

The nine employee groups at each of the three campuses thus constituted 27 strata. Following the mail part of the survey, a sample of about 25 percent of the nonrespondents for each stratum was followed up by telephone.[1]

[1] It earlier had been decided to use the phone followup for those strata where the return rate from the mail survey was less than 70 percent. No stratum reached this rate, necessitating general use of the phone follow-up procedure.

The purpose of the sampling design was to provide a total response of at least 100 useable records for each stratum with the exception of the Skilled, Semi-skilled, and Unskilled workers (employee group 8) at each campus, for which the goal was a total response of at least 175 useable records. The higher requirement was set for the latter group because of the relatively highly heterogeneous nature of that group.

The response criterion was met for all but three of the employee groups (strata) at the Urbana-Champaign Campus, these three being Tenured Faculty; Skilled, Semi-skilled, and Unskilled; and Service Workers. (See Table 1.) However, for none of these groups did the deficit appear to be particularly sizable. At Chicago Circle, five employee groups failed to meet the response criterion--Non-tenured Faculty; Graduate Assistants; Officials and Managers; Professional and Technical; and Office and Clerical. Moreover, the deficiency for each of these, excluding the Non-tenured Faculty and possibly the Professional and Technical groups, was rather marked, the response being no more than 50 percent of the desired goal. The situation at Medical Center was even more disappointing, with no employee group reaching the response criterion. The serious deficits at that campus occurred for the following groups: Graduate Assistants; Officials and Managers; Professional and Technical; Office and Clerical; Skilled, Semi-skilled, and Unskilled; and Service Workers. None of those groups was able to achieve more than about half the desired response criterion. Thus the difficulty in realizing the response goal was most pronounced for the Graduate Assistants; Officials and Managers; Office and Clerical; Skilled, Semi-skilled, and Unskilled; and Service Workers groups at the two Chicago campuses.

TABLE 1

RESPONSE PATTERN FOR UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS EMPLOYEES JOB SATISFACTION STUDY

Campus	Employee Group								
	Academic Staff				Nonacademic Staff				
	(1) Tenured Faculty	(2) Non-tenured Faculty	(3) Profes-sionals	(4) Grad. Asst.	(5) Officials & Managers	(6) Prof. & Tech.	(7) Office & Clerical	(8) Skilled, Semi-skilled, Unskilled	(9) Service Workers
Urbana-Champaign									
Sample Size	148	202	175	175	164	175	175	250	175
Total No. of Responses	94	122	110	103	119	112	112	131	73
(Mail)	(87)	(110)	(98)	(88)	(110)	(99)	(100)	(104)	(56)
(Phone)	(7)	(12)	(12)	(15)	(9)	(13)	(12)	(27)	(17)
Chicago Circle									
Sample Size	175	175	175	175	68	175	175	--[1]	--[1]
Total No. of Responses	102	94	102	50	35	64	43	--[1]	--[1]
(Mail)	(87)	(78)	(87)	(29)	(28)	(45)	(32)	--[1]	--[1]
(Phone)	(15)	(16)	(15)	(21)	(7)	(19)	(11)	--[1]	--[1]
Medical Center									
Sample Size	175	175	111	175	92	175	175	250[2]	175[2]
Total No. of Responses	92	88	69	45	49	54	49	98[2]	38[2]
(Mail)	(77)	(72)	(57)	(28)	(37)	(41)	(36)	(72)[2]	(26)[2]
(Phone)	(15)	(16)	(12)	(17)	(12)	(13)	(13)	(26)[2]	(12)[2]

[1] The sampling procedure failed to identify any employees in this group at Chicago Circle since such employees actually are part of the Medical Center payroll.

[2] The employees in this group actually work at both Chicago campuses. They are identified with Medical Center for record (payroll) purposes.

Note.--None of the employee groups at any campus met the 70 percent return rate from the mail survey that would have precluded the need for a phone followup of the nonrespondents.

UBIR-FLD-9/6/74

The limited response rates from the mail request for certain of the strata served to emphasize the necessity for the telephone follow-up provision, the primary purpose of which was to permit an assessment of the extent of possible bias in the data collected via the mail survey. The data collected by mail and by phone were analyzed separately and appeared to be sufficiently similar to sustain the conclusion that the mail survey results in the aggregate were reasonably representative of the total sample. However, in order to adjust for any possible bias within the mail results, the telephone data were weighted by four (the phone interviews having been made on a 25 percent sample of the nonrespondents) and combined with the mail data in the final analyses of the survey results.

Most of the questions in the questionnaire used a response scale consisting of two positive or favorable (e.g., "Very good" and "Good") and two negative or unfavorable (e.g., "Poor" and "Very poor") responses. All discussion in this report of the results from such questions concerns only the two positive, or favorable, responses in combination (i.e., the sum of the results for the two positive responses). This procedure no doubt has masked differences of degree in the results for any questions with greatly different distributions of responses (i.e., one question with 20 percent "Very good" and 30 percent "Good" responses and another with 40 percent "Very good" and 10 percent "Good", both of which would be treated as having produced 50 percent favorable--"Very good" or "Good"--responses). On the other hand, inclusion of the detailed data in the discussion would have made the report almost hopelessly complex. Furthermore, this more simplistic treatment of the results, it is felt, has served to provide a

generally accurate flavor of the results.[2] The detailed distributions are presented in the tables in Appendix B for the convenience of anyone who might wish to see them.

The Employees Surveyed

The sample of employees for whom useable records or questionnaires were received totaled 2048, distributed by campus as follows: Urbana-Champaign, 976; Chicago Circle, 490; Medical Center, 582.

Eighty-two percent (1684) of the completed questionnaires resulted from the mail request, and the remaining eighteen percent (364) from the telephone interviews.

Two thirds of the respondents were males. Their average (median) age was about 38 years. One-half[3] of the employees in the sample indicated that they had at some point had a similar job outside the University. Most of these persons (76 percent) had held such jobs for from one to three years.

Three-fourths of the respondents had been employed at the University 10 years or less, with an average (median) for the sample of about 5 years.

A substantial minority of the sample of employees--26 percent--stated that they were members of a professional or trade union.

---

[2]The possibility of weighting the responses (e.g., double weighting extremely positive responses such as "Very good") was dismissed because of the lack of inherent meaning in the resulting data and in the interest of expediting the preparation of the report.

[3]This and subsequent proportions reported are based on the sample resulting from having added the weighted telephone interviews to the mail survey responses.

II. RESULTS

A. Rating of Job Compared to Other Similar Jobs

The first question in the questionnaire asked the respondent to rate his job (on a scale of Very good, Good, Poor, Very poor), in comparison to similar jobs or to jobs in his field, on each of the following items or factors:

a. Earnings
b. Prospects for financial security;
c. Prospects for a comfortable retirement;
d. Opportunities for promotion;
e. Opportunities to use yourskills and training;
f. Opportunities to control how your job is done;
g. Opportunities to make suggestions and influence decisions in your unit;
h. Chances of bringing about needed changes in your unit.

University-wide and Campus Results. University-wide and for each of the three campuses individually, the items concerning opportunities to use one's skills and training (item e), to control how the job is done (item f), and to make suggestions and influence decisions in one's unit (item g) attracted the highest degree of positive reactions, each with "Good" or "Very good" responses from between 67 and 83 percent of the employees responding. At the other extreme, opportunities for promotion (item d) were perceived least favorably, with only 37 percent positive ("Good" or "Very good") responses University-wide, and less than 50 percent at each campus. The remaining items in this question attracted between 54 and 58 percent favorable responses for the campuses combined.

Campus Differences. That there were rather substantial inter-campus differences on the first question is suggested by the campus medians for the percents of favorable responses for the eight items, which were 67 percent for Medical Center, 57 percent for Urbana-Champaign, and 53 percent for Chicago Circle.

The Medical Center employees did in fact rather consistently evidence the highest degree of satisfaction among the three campuses, with the largest proportion of "Good" and "Very good" responses for seven of the eight items in this question, Moreover, for four of the seven--those dealing with earnings, financial security, comfortable retirement, and promotion--the proportion of favorable reactions by Medical Center employees indeed was markedly higher than that for one or both of the other two campuses. Never were the Medical Center employees decidedly below either of the other campuses in favorableness of reaction.

The Chicago Circle employees by contrast quite frequently--for five of the eight items--exhibited the lowest level of satisfaction of the three campuses. On three of these items--the ones regarding earnings, financial security, and retirement--the differences were substantial. On no item was the percent of favorable responses for Chicago Circle employees markedly higher than those for both the other campuses.

The employees at Urbana-Champaign produced the lowest percent of favorable responses on the item dealing with opportunities for promotion. Otherwise that campus' employees either were intermediate to the other two campuses or did not differ markedly from them.

Academic Vs. Nonacademic Employees. For five of the items in the first question--those dealing with opportunities for promotion (item d), use of skills and training (item e), control of how the job is done (item f), making suggestions and influencing decisions in the unit (item g), and chances of bringing about needed changes in the unit (item h)--the academic employees surveyed responded considerably more favorably than the nonacademic employees both University-wide and generally for the individual campuses, particularly Urbana-Champaign and the Medical Center.

Only for the items concerning financial security and retirement (items b and c) did the nonacademic employees rather consistently evidence a more favorable reaction than the academic staff, although on both of these the differences at Urbana-Champaign were slight.

The item on earnings (item a) produced a varied response pattern. There essentially were no differences between academic and nonacademic employees University-wide and at the Urbana-Champaign Campus in their response to this item, but differences did occur for the other two campuses. At the Medical Center the nonacademic staff responded more favorably then the academic staff to the item. The reverse occurred for Chicago Circle, with academic employees answering more favorably. The response for the two Chicago campuses, as will be evident later, probably would have been more alike had the Chicago Circle not been missing the Skilled, Semi-skilled, and Unskilled and the Service Workers groups.

Differences Among Academic Employees. There were University-wide differences among the academic employee groups--Tenured Faculty; Non-tenured Faculty; Professionals; and Graduate Assistants--in their reactions to the items in the first question in the questionnaire.

The most consistently occurring such difference, which was exhibited on every item except the one on earnings, was a tendency for the Graduate Assistants to respond least favorably of the four employee groups. These were not altogether surprising differences, in view of the peculiar position of the Graduate Assistant within the academic staff.

The only other instances of marked contrast among the academic staff centered on the Professional group. This group, as well as the Graduate Assistants, responded considerably more favorably to the item on earnings (item a) than did either the Tenured Faculty or Non-tenured Faculty groups.

It also produced more favorable responses than the Tenured or Non-tenured groups to the item dealing with opportunities to make suggestions and to influence decisions (item g). Finally, the Professional group (along with Graduate Assistants) reacted much less favorably than the faculty groups to the item on opportunities for promotion (item d). The latter difference no doubt was partly a function of the tendency for members of the Professional academic staff not to hold academic rank.

The proportions of favorable responses ("Good" and "Very good") for the Tenured and the Non-tenured academic staff to the items in this section consistently were quite similar.

Differences Among Nonacademic Employees. Substantial differences among the nonacademic employee groups--Officials and Managers; Professional and Technical; Office and Clerical; Skilled, Semi-skilled, and Unskilled; and Service Workers--occurred for every item in the first question. For the items on earnings, financial security, retirement, and the use of skills and training (items a, b, c, and e), the Skilled, Semi-skilled, and Unskilled group produced markedly larger proportions of positive ("Good" and "Very good") responses than the other groups. For the item concerning opportunities for promotion (item d), the Office and Clerical group responded more favorably than the other groups, although none of the positive response percentages was high. On the item concerning opportunities to make suggestions and influence decisions (item g), the Officials and Managers and the Professional and Technical groups both answered more favorably than did the other nonacademic employee groups. For the remaining two items--opportunities to control how the job is done (item f) and chances of bringing about needed changes (item h)--

the Professional and Technical Group responded most favorably. On the latter item the Skilled, Semi-skilled, and Unskilled and the Service Workers groups were noticeably less satisfied than the other groups.

B. Rating of Job-Related Factors Compared to Other Similar Jobs

The second question in the questionnaire requested the responding employee to react to his job (on a scale of Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly disagree) in comparison to other similar jobs or to jobs in his field on each of the following job-related variables or characteristics:

a. My workload here is about the same;
b. I can advance professionally here;
c. I can improve my skills here;
d. I have adequate opportunity for study or research in my field here;
e. I can accomplish most of the things I want to here;
f. The space and facilities I need to do a good job are available;
g. The supplies and equipment I need to do a good job are available;
h. The supporting services I need to do a good job are available.

University-wide and Campus Results. University-wide and for each of the three campuses, the highest degree of positive reaction occurred for the three items dealing with the improvement of skills, availability of supplies and equipment, and availability of supporting services (items c, g, and h), each of which elicited "Agree" or "Strongly agree" responses from more than 70 percent of the participating employees. The smallest amount of general satisfaction among the eight items was exhibited for the item concerning the chance to advance professionally (item b), with only 51 percent favorable (Agree or Strongly agree) responses University-wide and no more than 63 percent such responses at any campus. For the remaining items, the proportion of positive reactions University-wide ranged between 60 and 70 percent.

Campus Differences. Among the employees of the three campuses the differences in perception of workload (item a), chance to advance professionally (item c), and opportunity to study or research in one's field (item d) were

small. By contrast, for three of the other items--those on the availability of space and facilities (item f), the availability of supplies and equipment (item g), and the availability of supporting services (item h)--the Urbana-Champaign employees were markedly more satisfied than were the employees at one or both of the other two campuses. On the remaining two items--the chance to advance professionally (item b) and the chance to accomplish most of the things desired (item e)--the Medical Center employees responded substantially more favorably than those at Chicago Circle and/or Urbana-Champaign.

For three of the eight items--item b, item e, and item f-- the employees at one of the campuses were decidedly less satisfied than the employees at the other two campuses. Regarding the chance for professional advancement (item b), the Urbana-Champaign employees were least satisfied. On the item concerning the chance to accomplish desired things (item e), the Chicago Circle employees exhibited the lowest level of satisfaction. The least satisfaction with the availability of space and facilities (item f), was reflected by the Medical Center respondents.

The lack of a consistent pattern in the inter-campus differences for the second question is reflected further by the similarity of the campus medians for the eight item percents--71 percent for Urbana-Champaign and 69 percent for each of the other campuses.

Academic Vs. Nonacademic Employees. Both University-wide and in general for the campuses individually, the academic employees displayed a more favorable reaction than did the nonacademic employees to five of the eight items in the second question--those on advancement (item b), skills improvement (item c), opportunity for study or research (item d), accomplishment of desired things (item e), and availability of space and facilities (item f).

Only for the item having to do with availability of supporting services (item h) did the nonacademic employees consistently respond more favorably.

For the remaining two items--those on workload (item a) and availability of supplies and equipment (item g)--there essentially was no difference University-wide between the reactions of academic and nonacademic employees. However, in the case of item a, the academic employees at Chicago Circle responded markedly more favorably than did the nonacademic employees.

Differences Among Academic Employees. There were differences among the academic employee groups--Tenured Faculty, Non-tenured Faculty, Professionals, and Graduate Assistants--in their responses to each of the eight items in the second question.

The most frequently occurring difference was a tendency for the Graduate Assistants to react more favorably than the other academic groups. This happened on the four items dealing with opportunity for study or research in one's field (item d), availability of space and facilities (item f), availability of supplies and equipment (item g), and availability of supporting services (item h).

On two other items--the ones on workload (item a) and opportunity to accomplish desired things (item e)--the Professional employees reacted less favorably than the other three academic groups.

For the item on chance for professional advancement (item b), both the Tenured and Non-tenured Faculty reacted more positively (higher percent of "Agree" or "Strongly agree") than the other two groups. On the remaining item, on opportunity to improve skills (item c), both the Non-tenured Faculty and the Graduate Assistants responded more favorably than did either the Tenured Faculty or the Professional employees group.

Differences Among Nonacademic Employees. Differences occurred among the nonacademic employees groups on each of the items in question 2.

Several employee groups displayed a tendency to react most favorably on one item and least favorably on another. The Office and Clerical group, for example, responded most favorably of the nonacademic groups to the item on availability of supplies and equipment (item g), but least favorably to the item on workload (item a). Similarly, the Service Workers group reacted most positively to the availability of space and facilities (item f), but least favorably to the opportunity to improve skills (item c). Again, the Skilled, Semi-skilled, and Unskilled employee group responded most favorably of the nonacademic groups to the items on workload (item a) and opportunity to accomplish desired things (item e), but least positively on the item dealing with opportunity to study or research in one's field (item d). Those differences involved six of the items in the second question.

For the two remaining items two employee groups clustered markedly above or below the other groups. On the item concerning the chance to advance professionally (item b), the Skilled, Semi-skilled, and Unskilled and the Service Workers groups responded less favorably than did the other nonacademic groups. On the item having to do with availability of supporting services (item h), the Office and Clerical and the Skilled, Semi-skilled, and Unskilled groups reacted more favorably than did the other groups.

C. Rating of Job Compared to Different Jobs in Unit

The third question in the questionnaire asked the employee to express his/her feelings regarding the job (on a scale of Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree,

Strongly disagree), in comparison to different jobs in his/her unit or department on each of the following job-related items:

a. The importance of my job is well recognized;
b. I get full credit for the work I do;
c. I am proud of the work I do;
d. I like the work I do;
e. I feel important here;
f. I feel needed here;
g. I feel liked here;
h. I feel respected here.

University-wide and Campus Results. The items in question 3 that drew the most favorable reaction University-wide and for the campuses separately were item c (I am proud of the work I do), item d (I like the work I do), and item g (I feel liked here), the percent of "Agree" and "Strongly agree" responses to each of these items approximating or exceeding 90 in every instance. At the other extreme was item e (I feel important here) for which the proportion of employees reacting positively (responding "Agree" or "Strongly agree") was 68 percent University-wide and between 64 and 75 percent for the campuses. For the other four items from 72 to 85 percent of the employees University-wide answered either "Agree" or "Strongly agree".

Campus Differences. There was a decided tendency for the Medical Center employees to respond most favorably of the three campuses on question 3, this situation having occurred for seven of the eight items (all except item d). For five of these items (items a, b, e, f, and h) the differences between the Medical Center results and those for one or both the other campuses were fairly substantial. The Chicago Circle employees just as frequently--on the same seven items--reacted least favorably. On five of these items (items a, b, e, f, and h) the proportions of positive

responses for Chicago Circle employees were markedly less than those for the Urbana-Champaign and/or the Medical Center employees. The Urbana-Champaign employees more often than not were intermediate to the employees at the other two campuses. At no time were they considerably more satisfied than the other two campus' employees.

The above inter-campus differences are mirrored by the medians of the item percents for the three campuses--85 percent for the Medical Center, 81 percent for Urbana-Champaign, and 77 percent for Chicago Circle.

For items c (I am proud of the work I do) and d (I like the work I do), the differences among the three campuses were negligible.

Academic Vs. Nonacademic Employees. There were no marked University-wide differences between academic and nonacademic employees on question 3. In fact, on most of the items the proportions of "Agree" and "Strongly agree" responses were practically identical.

Several more sizable differences did occur for individual campuses. On item a (The importance of my job is well recognized) the nonacademic employees at Chicago Circle responded somewhat more favorably than did the academic employees, whereas the reverse took place for the Medical Center employees. For item b (I get full credit for the work I do) the Medical Center academic staff indicated a higher degree of satisfaction than did the nonacademic staff. On item e (I feel important here) more academic than nonacademic staff at Urbana-Champaign reacted favorably. Finally, the nonacademic employees at Chicago Circle responded more positively than the academic staff to item f (I feel needed here).

Differences Among Academic Employees. The only noticeable difference University-wide among the four academic employee groups was a tendency for the Graduate Assistants to react less favorably than the other groups. This situation occurred for item a (The importance of my job is well

recognized), item d (I like the work I do), item e (I feel important here), item f (I feel needed here), and item h (I feel respected here). These are somewhat understandable reactions by the Graduate Assistants when viewed in the context of the role played by those employees and their relatively temporary nature.

The other three academic employee groups were remarkably similar in their responses to the items in question 3.

Differences Among Nonacademic Employees. The most recurring differences among the five nonacademic employee groups concerned the Office and Clerical group, which responded least favorably of the employee groups on item c (I am proud of the work I do), item d (I like the work I do), and item e (I feel important here).

On item a (The importance of my job is well recognized) the Professional and Technical group reacted more positively than the other nonacademic groups, and on item f (I feel needed here) the same situation occurred for Service Workers.

On the remaining items of question 3 (b, g, h) the nonacademic employee groups were quite similar in their responses.

D. Rating of Co-workers

Question 4 in the questionnaire called for a rating of the employee's co-workers (on a scale of Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly disagree) on each of the following traits:

a. Intelligence;
b. Friendliness;
c. Competence;
d. Cooperation.

University-wide and Campus Results. University-wide and at each of the three campuses, the employees surveyed responded very favorably regarding their

co-workers' intelligence and friendliness, in every case the relative frequency of "Agree" and "Strongly agree" reactions being in excess of 90 percent. Co-workers were perceived only somewhat less favorably in terms of their competence and cooperation, with the proportions of positive responses ("Agree" or "Strongly agree") being near 90 percent University-wide and ranging from 83 to 92 percent for the campuses.

Campus Differences. The Urbana-Champaign employees rated their co-workers more favorably than did those at the other campuses on each of the four traits, and Chicago Circle's employees just as consistently perceived their co-workers least favorably. However, the inter-campus differences were of no great practical significance, the largest such difference being only 9 percentage points (for item c on competence where the percents ranged from 92 for Urbana-Champaign to 83 for Chicago Circle).

Academic Vs. Nonacademic Employees. The most pronounced University-wide differences between academic and nonacademic employees in their ratings of co-workers occurred for intelligence (item a) and competence (item c), both of which produced somewhat higher proportions of favorable responses among the academic employees. While these differences were not large, they were repeated at each campus, being rather marked at Chicago Circle and Medical Center in the case of intelligence and at Chicago Circle for competence.

Differences Among Academic Employees. The four academic employee groups--Tenured Faculty; Non-tenured Faculty; Professionals; and Graduate Assistants--did not differ materially in the extent to which they favorably rated their co-workers on intelligence, friendliness, competence, and cooperation.

Differences Among Nonacademic Employees. The most marked difference among the nonacademic employee groups--Officials and Managers; Professional and

Technical; Office and Clerical; Skilled, Semi-skilled, and Unskilled; and Service Workers--was exhibited for competence (item c), on which the Skilled, Semi-skilled, and Unskilled and the Service Workers groups rated co-workers somewhat more favorably than did the other groups. The differences among the ratings on the other traits were more modest.

E. Rating of Boss

Question 5 asked the responding employee to evaluate his boss (Chairman, Director, Supervisor, etc.) on each of the following qualities (on a scale from Strongly agree to Strongly disagree):

a. Honesty;
b. Fairness;
c. Competence;
d. Cooperation.

University-wide and Campus Results. The highest rating given to the boss University-wide and for each campus was for honesty (item a), 91 percent of all employees surveyed agreeing or strongly agreeing that their boss was honest. The corresponding campus percents for this item ranged from 87 to 93. The lowest rating consistently was given for fairness (item b) for which the proportions of favorable ("Agree" or "Strongly agree") reactions were 84 percent University-wide and between 81 and 87 percent for the campuses. Thus, the ratings generally were quite high.

Campus Differences. Although for each of the four qualities the Medical Center employees produced the highest proportion of favorable ratings and the Chicago Circle employees the lowest, the inter-campus differences generally were not large.

Academic Vs. Nonacademic Employees. University-wide the ratings of the boss by academic and nonacademic employees were almost identical. There were,

however, several modest differences within the campuses. Academic employees at both Urbana-Champaign and the Medical Center rated their bosses somewhat more favorably on fairness (item b) than did nonacademic employees. At Chicago Circle, supervisors were rated moderately more positively on competence by nonacademic than by academic employees. Finally, a somewhat higher proportion of nonacademic employees at Chicago Circle and academic employees at Medical Center responded "Agree" or "Strongly agree" on the item dealing with the cooperation of the boss.

Differences Among Academic Employees. The Graduate Assistants consistently rated the boss more favorably than did the other three academic employee groups (Tenured Faculty; Non-tenured Faculty; and Professionals). This difference was strongest on fairness (item b) and competence (item c). The percents of positive responses ("Agree" or "Strongly agree") for the other academic groups were quite alike for each item.

Differences Among Nonacademic Employees. The differences among the nonacademic employee groups in favorableness of the ratings of the boss were not striking, nor did any one group consistently stand above or below the others.

F. Rating of Job Related Information

Question 6 in the questionnaire requested the responding employee to rate (on a scale of Very adequate, Adequate, Inadequate, Very inadequate) job-related information received from newsletters, bulletin boards, and bulletins. If the information received was deemed to be inadequate, the employee was requested to suggest what additional information was desired.

University-wide and Campus Results. University-wide 79 percent of the employees responding judged the job-related information received to be either

"Adequate" or "Very adequate". A somewhat lower proportion of Chicago Circle employees (73 percent) than either Urbana-Champaign or Medical Center employees (83 and 80 percent respectively) felt that the information received was adequate or very adequate.

For all campuses combined the most frequently mentioned suggestions concerning the information received were (1) to provide more information on insurance and retirement and (2) to improve the information already being received. These two points were made by 26 percent and 18 percent respectively of the employees who felt that the information received is not adequate. No other suggestion was noted by as many as 10 percent of these employees.

Academic Vs. Nonacademic Employees. University-wide and for Chicago Circle the proportions of academic and nonacademic employees judging the job-related information received to be satisfactory ("Adequate" or "Very adequate") were essentially the same. However, for the other two campuses there were differences, with nonacademic employees somewhat more satisfied than academic employees at Urbana-Champaign and the reverse true at the Medical Center.

Among the employees who had found the job-related information received to be inadequate, academic employees more often than nonacademic employees were concerned about the fact that they do not receive the information at all, while nonacademic employees more often than academic employees were critical of the fact that they do not receive information on time. (These comparisons were restricted to suggestions mentioned by at least 10 percent of the dissatisfied academic or nonacademic employees.)

Differences Among Academic Employees. The Graduate Assistants were noticeably less satisfied with the adequacy of the information received about the job and related matters (70 percent "Adequate" or "Very adequate" responses) than were Tenured Faculty, Non-tenured Faculty, or Professionals (83, 80, and 74 percent respectively).

Differences Among Nonacademic Employees. Among nonacademic employees, the smallest percent of satisfied responses ("Adequate" or "Very Adequate") to the item on the adequacy of job-related information received (74 percent) occurred for Service Workers. The percentage of satisfied responses for the other nonacademic groups ranged from 77 percent for Officials and Managers to 85 percent for Skilled, Semi-skilled and Unskilled employees.

G. Preference for Working at U. of I. and/or In Same Kind of Job

Question 7 asked the participating employee to indicate whether he would prefer to work at the University of Illinois or elsewhere and whether he would prefer to work on the same or a different kind of job.

University-wide and Campus Results. Overall, 70 percent of the employees responding indicated that they would prefer to work at the University and the same percentage stated that they would prefer to work in the same kind of job they now have.

Substantially fewer of the Chicago Circle employees (56 percent) than those at Urbana Champaign (72 percent) or Medical Center (78 percent) would prefer working at the U. of I. However, the proportions at the three campuses who would want to continue in the same kind of job were very similar, ranging from 68 percent for Urbana-Champaign to 72 percent at Medical Center.

Academic Vs. Nonacademic Employees. University-wide considerably more nonacademic than academic employees (78 percent compared to 62 percent) would prefer to work at the University than elsewhere. This same pattern followed for each of the three campuses.

University-wide and for each campus, the academic employees more frequently than the nonacademic employees indicated that they would like the kind of job they now have. For the three campuses combined, the proportions were 74 percent for academic and 67 percent for nonacademic staff.

Differences Among Academic Employees. There were differences among the academic employee groups on both parts of question 7.

Concerning preferred place of employment, preference for working at the University was indicated relatively more frequently by the Professional employee group (70 percent) than for any of the other three groups (60 for both Tenured and Non-tenured Faculty and 57 for Graduate Assistants).

Regarding preferred type of employment, Tenured Faculty more often (89 percent) than the other groups (81 percent for Non-tenured Faculty, 75 percent for Professionals, and 46 percent for Graduate Assistants) stated a preference for continuing in the kind of job now held.

Differences Among Nonacademic Employees. Differences occurred among the nonacademic employee groups on both parts of question 7.

The Professional and Technical and the Office and Clerical groups least often (71 and 68 percent of the time respectively) of the nonacademic groups indicated a preference for working at the University. The corresponding values for the other groups ranged between 80 and 87 percent.

The Officials and Managers and the Skilled, Semi-skilled, and Unskilled groups substantially more frequently (75 and 83 percent of the time respectively) than the other groups (48 percent for Service Workers to 63 percent for Professional and Technical) stated a preference for the kinds of jobs they have.

H. Things Liked Best About Working at the University

The eighth substantive question in the questionnaire (actually question 16)[4] asked the employee to indicate the three things liked best about working at the University of Illinois. The question was otherwise unstructured. Since the unstructured format of the question led to somewhat differing responses by the academic and nonacademic employees, the results have not been combined for all employees.

For the University as a whole the academic employees responding to the questionnaire cited the following factors most frequently as those they like best about working at the University:

Type of Work (interesting, varied, challenging, responsible; freedom to pursue interests)	49 percent
Colleagues (friendly, cooperative, stimulating)	28 percent
Geographic or Physical Surroundings (atmosphere; cultural / recreational opportunities; location)	28 percent
Working Conditions (general conditions; flexibility regarding when or how work done; work load)	24 percent
Distinction of University	24 percent
Physical Facilities (including library)	24 percent

"Type of work" was by far the first choice at each of the campuses. There were some campus variations in the order of the other factors, but the University-wide pattern followed generally at each campus, with the exception of the fact that "Physical Facilities" were not cited among the

[4] Questions 8 thru 15 in the questionnaire concern the identification or description of the respondent on variables such as sex and age.

top six factors by either the Medical Center or Chicago Circle academic employees, having been edged by "Opportunity for Personal and Professional Growth" at the former campus and by "Students" at the latter campus.

Among the Nonacademic employees the following factors were listed most often University-wide as those best liked about working at the University:

Fringe Benefits (insurance and medical; vacation, holiday, and sick leave; retirement) . . . . . 68 percent

Working Conditions (general conditions; flexibility regarding hours or duties; satisfactory supervision) . . . . . 45 percent

Co-Workers (congenial, cooperative) . . . . . 28 percent

Job Security (steady work). . . . . 27 percent

Type of Work (interesting, varied, challenging, responsible) . . . . . 20 percent

These also were the top factors listed by Urbana-Champaign and Medical Center employees, although the order beyond the first two factors was not identical. At Chicago Circle, all but "Job Security" and "Type of Work" were among the five most often mentioned factors. These two factors were exceeded by "Academic Atmosphere" and "Opportunity for Education and Training". These differences for Chicago Circle nonacademic employees could have resulted from the absence of the Skilled, Semi-skilled, and Unskilled and the Service Workers from that campus' sample.

I. Things Liked Least About Working at the University

The next question requested the respondent to list the three things liked least about working at the University. This question was as unstructured as the question concerning things liked.

University-wide the factors most often mentioned as least liked by the academic employees were as follows:

Salary (level; distribution)	32 percent
Administration (quality; approach)	23 percent
Bureaucratic Red Tape	18 percent
Physical Location and Surroundings	16 percent
Physical Facilities	14 percent

"Salary" also was cited most often by academic employees at both Urbana and Medical Center. At Chicago Circle this concern was exceeded by "Administration" as the least liked factor. The only factors, of the five listed above, not among the top five at all three campuses were "Physical Location and Surroundings", missing at Chicago Circle, and "Physical Facilities", not included at Urbana-Champaign.

The factors least liked University-wide by nonacademic employees were the following:

Salary (level; distribution)	37 percent
Supervision (quality)	15 percent
Opportunity for Advancement	15 percent
Bureaucratic Red Tape	13 percent
Physical Facilities	12 percent

"Salary" likewise was the least liked factor among nonacademic staff at each campus. There were, however, some shifts among the campuses from the University-wide picture for several of the other factors. For example, "Physical Facilities" was among the top five factors only at the Medical Center. On the other hand, "Opportunity for Advancement" was not cited

frequently enough by Medical Center nonacademic employees to make the first five. Finally, factors listed at individual campuses, but which were not mentioned enough at other campuses to be in the top five University-wide were "Location and Neighborhood" at Medical Center and "Departmental Politics or Favoritism" at Chicago Circle.

J. Things That Could Be Changed to Improve Working Conditions

The final question in the questionnaire asked the responding employee to list the three most important things that could be changed to make working at the University of Illinois better.

University-wide the academic employees in the sample suggested the following things most frequently:

Improved Salaries.	36 percent
Improved Facilities.	25 percent
Improved Administration.	22 percent
Improved Fringe Benefits	13 percent
Improved Budgets	11 percent

"Improved Salaries" was cited most frequently by academic employees at Urbana-Champaign and Medical Center. At Chicago Circle, however, it was replaced by "Improved Administration" as the most often suggested improvement. The only instances wherein the campuses failed to include the above five items as the top five occurred at the Chicago Circle and Medical Center campuses. At Chicago Circle "Increased Cooperation and Communication" replaced "Improved Fringe Benefits" in the top five, while at Medical Center "Increased Cooperation and Communication" replaced "Improved Budgets".

The nonacademic employees as a group mentioned the following items most often as things that could be changed to improve working conditions at the University:

Improved Salaries . . . . . 36 percent

Improved Supervision. . . . . 28 percent

Improved Fringe Benefits. . . . . 17 percent

Reduced Bureaucratic Red Tape . . . . . 15 percent

Improved Facilities . . . . . 15 percent

"Improved Salaries" was also the item most frequently listed by nonacademic employees at each of the three campuses. In fact, the only campus deviations from the items cited most often University-wide took place at Urbana-Champaign where "Increased Opportunity for Advancement" replaced "Improved Facilities" and at Chicago Circle where the same item kept "Improved Fringe Benefits" out of the top five items.

The lists of items suggested by academic and nonacademic employees are quite similar. Not only does "Improved Salaries" head each list, but three other items are common to both lists. Only "Improved Budgets" and "Reduced Bureaucratic Red Tape" are unique to one of the lists, the former having been mentioned only by academic and the latter by nonacademic employees.

III. CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There are differences, both University-wide and among the three campuses, in the way the University's employees feel about their job situation. Moreover, there are distinctions between academic and non-academic employees and within each of these groups.

University-wide, the University's academic and nonacademic employees as a whole are well satisfied with the following job-related factors or circumstances, each item having been responded to favorably by at least three-fourths of the employees surveyed, with the percentages often approaching or exceeding ninety percent:

(1) The work itself--pride in and liking for one's work;
(2) Co-workers--their friendliness, intelligence, competence, and cooperation;
(3) Feeling of being liked, respected, and needed;
(4) The boss--his/her honesty, competence, cooperation, and fairness;
(5) Opportunity to use and to improve one's skills and training;
(6) Opportunity to control how the job is done;
(7) Availability of needed supporting services, supplies, and equipment;
(8) The job-related information received.

The lowest relative level of satisfaction among University employees as a group apparently centers around the following job-related factors or circumstances, each item having been responded to unfavorably by more than 40 percent of the employees included in the study:

(1) Opportunity for promotion and professional advancement;
(2) Prospects for a comfortable retirement;
(3) Earnings and prospects for financial security;
(4) Chances of bringing about needed changes in one's unit.

Where inter-campus differences in level of satisfaction exist, and the survey findings suggest that such differences are rather general, the tendency is for the Medical Center employees to be most satisfied and the Chicago Circle employees least satisfied, with the Urbana-Champaign employees intermediate to the other two.

This higher overall degree of dissatisfaction on the part of Chicago Circle employees is substantiated by the fact that relatively fewer employees at that campus, compared to the employees at the other campuses, would prefer to continue working at the University.

There is no consistent distinction between academic and nonacademic employees in their degree of job satisfaction. On some factors the academic staff are somewhat more satisfied while on others the reverse is true.

Academic employees collectively appear to be more satisfied than nonacademic employees on factors such as the opportunities (1) for promotion and professional advancement, (2) to use and to improve one's skills and training, (3) to control how the job is done, (4) to bring about needed changes in one's unit, (5) to study or research in one's field, and (6) to accomplish desired things. Academic staff, moreover, are more inclined to be favorably impressed by the distinction or imminence of the University, by its physical facilities, and by the academic atmosphere and surroundings.

Nonacademic employees as a group seem to be more satisfied than academic employees concerning such variables as (1) prospects for financial and job security, (2) prospects for a comfortable retirement, and (3) the fringe benefits. These factors are related more to the conditions of employment with the University than to the work itself, which is consistent with the fact that nonacademic employees are noticeably more inclined than academic staff to indicate a preference for working at the University, but are somewhat less predisposed than academics to working in the same kind of job they now hold.

Academic and nonacademic employees apparently are strikingly in agreement regarding what could be changed to improve working conditions at the University. Both most frequently cite salaries as the item most in need of improvement.

There are University-wide differences among both academic and non-academic employees in degree of satisfaction with employment at the University. The most consistent difference within the academic employees is a tendency for Graduate Assistants to be less satisfied than other academic staff, and even this tendency is reversed for some aspects of the employment situation. Among the nonacademic staff, the most pronounced tendency is for Skilled, Semi-skilled, and Unskilled employees to exhibit the highest level of satisfaction, but this trend occurs for less than half the job-related variables included in the study.

Limitations. The results and the conclusions reached do not pertain to individual colleges, schools or departments. Accordingly, they should not be applied to any particular units.

The findings and the conclusions are based on a questionnaire survey and therefore are limited to the extent that the reactions of the employees sampled represent their true feelings.

Recommendations. The results of the U. of I. Employees Job Satisfaction Study provide one measure of the job satisfaction of University employees. It is recommended that the findings serve as a basis for further consideration of areas of possible satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the employment situation at the University.

APPENDIX A:

QUESTIONNAIRE

April, 1974

To University Staff and Faculty Addressed:

I have asked for a survey of your opinions about your working situation at the University of Illinois. It is my hope that in this way I can identify ways in which I might take active steps to assure your employment here is pleasant and productive. It is of deep concern to me that you find working for this University a good experience.

Perhaps none of us is ever completely satisfied with all of the aspects of our employment no matter what we do or how many resources are available. But in times of limited resources it is especially important that whatever is available be used to best advantage. Sometimes relatively small changes can bring about relatively large improvements. The survey will assist me in deciding the appropriate priorities to be given in support of the several aspects of your employment here.

The Survey Research Laboratory is collecting the data for me. Dr. Sandra Warden, a visiting professor here this year as an American Council on Education administrative intern, is directing the study. If you have questions regarding the study, she may be reached on the Urbana campus at 133 Davenport House, 333-6486.

A sample of persons from each major group of academic and nonacademic employees has been selected for participation in the study. Since it is possible to sample the opinions of only a small percentage of those employed at the University of Illinois, your response is especially important. Your individual responses will be kept strictly confidential. In the report which will be shown to me, your responses will be combined with other employees' responses in computer tabulations. I need your cooperation to make these tabulations significant.

After filling out the questionnaire, please return it promptly to the Survey Research Laboratory in the enclosed envelope. If possible, return it by Campus Mail. If this is not convenient, return it by U.S. Mail.

Thank you for your help.

Cordially,

John E. Corbally, Jr.

John E. Corbally, Jr.
President

JEC:bf
Enclosures

OFFICE USE ONLY		
Quest. #		1-5
Study #	191	6-8
		9,10
		11-13
		14

4/74

Survey Research Laboratory
University of Illinois

U. of I. Employees Job Satisfaction Study 15-17 BK

Below are a series of statements asking you to compare various aspects of your job at the University of Illinois to other jobs in your field. Please read each statement and circle the number to the right that best represents your opinion.

	Very good	Good	Poor	Very poor	
1. Compared to other jobs like yours or in your field; how would you rate . . .					
a. Your earnings?	1	2	3	4	18
b. Your prospects for financial security?	1	2	3	4	19
c. Your prospects for a comfortable retirement? .	1	2	3	4	20
d. Your opportunities for promotion?	1	2	3	4	21
e. Your opportunities to use your skills and training?	1	2	3	4	22
f. Your opportunities to control how your job is done?	1	2	3	4	23
g. Your opportunities to make suggestions and influence decisions in your unit?	1	2	3	4	24
h. Your chances of bringing about needed changes in your unit?	1	2	3	4	25

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	
2. Compared to other jobs like mine or in my field . . .					
a. My workload here is about the same	1	2	3	4	26
b. I can advance professionally here	1	2	3	4	27
c. I can improve my skills here	1	2	3	4	28
d. I have adequate opportunity for study or research in my field here	1	2	3	4	29
e. I can accomplish most of the things I want to here	1	2	3	4	30
f. The space and facilities I need to do a good job are available	1	2	3	4	31
g. The supplies and equipment I need to do a good job are available	1	2	3	4	32
h. The supporting services *(such as, campus mail, motor pool, paging service, clerical service)* I need to do a good job are available	1	2	3	4	33

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	
3. Compared to different jobs in my unit or department . . .					
a. The importance of my job is well recognized	1	2	3	4	34
b. I get full credit for the work I do . . .	1	2	3	4	35
c. I am proud of the work I do	1	2	3	4	36
d. I like the work I do	1	2	3	4	37
e. I feel important here	1	2	3	4	38
f. I feel needed here	1	2	3	4	39
g. I feel liked here	1	2	3	4	40
h. I feel respected here	1	2	3	4	41

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	
4. Most of my co-workers here are . . .					
a. Intelligent	1	2	3	4	42
b. Friendly	1	2	3	4	43
c. Competent	1	2	3	4	44
d. Cooperative	1	2	3	4	45

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	
5. My boss *(Chairman, Director, Supervisor, etc.)* here is . . .					
a. Honest	1	2	3	4	46
b. Fair	1	2	3	4	47
c. Competent	1	2	3	4	48
d. Cooperative	1	2	3	4	49

6a. Employees at the University of Illinois receive information about things related to their jobs, such as retirement, civil service policy, insurance, and fringe benefits. In general, do you think that the information you receive from newsletters, bulletin boards, and bulletins is . . .

Very adequate, *(Skip to Q.7)* . . 1 50
Adequate, *(Skip to Q.7)* 2
Inadequate, ... 3
Very inadequate? 4

(If inadequate or very inadequate)
b. What additional information would you like to receive?

_____ 51,52

7a. If you really had a choice, would you prefer to work at the University of Illinois or somewhere else?

University of Illinois 1 53
Somewhere else 2
Wouldn't work 3

b. If you really had a choice, would you prefer the same kind of job you now have or a different kind of job?

Same kind of job 1 54
Different kind of job 2
Wouldn't work 3

8a. Have you ever had a similar job anywhere outside the University of Illinois?

Yes 1 55
No *(Skip to Q.9)* 2

b. In total, how many years have you worked in similar jobs outside the University?

_____ years 56,57

9. How many years have you worked at the University of Illinois?

_____ years 58,59

10. Are you a student at the University of Illinois?

Yes, full-time 1 60
Yes, part-time 2
No 3

11. If married, is your spouse a student at the University?

Yes, full-time 1 61
Yes, part-time 2
No 3
No spouse *(Skip to Q.13)* . 0

12. Is your spouse also employed at the University of Illinois?

Yes 1 62
No 2

13. Are you a member of a professional or trade union?

Yes 1 63
No 2

14. What is your age? . . . . . _____ years 64,65

15. What is your sex?

Male 1 66
Female . . . 2

67-79 | BK
80 | 1

16. What are the three things you like best about working at the University of Illinois?

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

17. What are the three things you like least about working at the University of Illinois?

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

18. What are the three most important things that could be changed to make working at the University of Illinois better?

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

Please return the questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed envelope.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

APPENDIX B:

DETAILED TABLES

TABLE 2

U. OF I. EMPLOYEES JOB SATISFACTION STUDY

QUESTION 1: ACADEMIC VS. NONACADEMIC EMPLOYEES BY CAMPUS

(DATA EXPRESSED AS PERCENTS)

		Urbana-Champaign				Chicago Circle				Medical Center				University-wide			
		Very good	Good	Poor	Very poor	Very good	Good	Poor	Very poor	Very good	Good	Poor	Very poor	Very good	Good	Poor	Very poor
1. Compared to other jobs like yours or in your field, how would you rate. . .																	
a. Your earnings?	Academic	6	51	38	5	4	51	32	13	8	49	36	7	6	51	35	8
	Nonacademic	6	50	37	7	5	35	49	11	10	63	25	2	7	52	35	6
	Total	6	51	37	6	5	46	37	12	9	57	30	4	7	51	35	7
b. Your prospects for financial security?	Academic	7	49	37	7	2	41	40	17	9	51	35	5	6	47	37	10
	Nonacademic	6	52	35	7	8	52	32	8	12	63	22	3	8	56	30	6
	Total	6	51	36	7	4	45	37	14	11	57	28	4	7	51	34	8
c. Your prospects for a comfortable retirement?	Academic	7	48	34	11	4	33	36	27	8	48	37	7	6	43	36	15
	Nonacademic	8	48	36	8	8	43	38	11	15	53	27	5	11	49	33	7
	Total	8	48	35	9	5	36	37	22	12	51	32	6	8	46	35	11
d. Your opportunities for promotion?	Academic	6	33	46	15	4	39	32	25	11	43	37	9	7	38	38	17
	Nonacademic	2	19	48	31	3	32	37	28	7	33	42	18	4	26	44	26
	Total	4	25	46	25	4	37	33	26	9	38	39	14	5	32	41	22
e. Your opportunities to use your skills and training?	Academic	37	52	9	2	30	55	13	2	43	48	7	2	36	52	10	2
	Nonacademic	14	61	19	6	23	55	16	6	23	53	18	6	18	58	18	6
	Total	24	57	15	4	28	55	14	3	33	51	12	4	28	54	14	4
f. Your opportunities to control how your job is done?	Academic	34	51	12	3	34	49	12	5	36	47	14	3	35	49	12	4
	Nonacademic	18	55	19	8	22	60	13	5	22	54	18	6	20	55	18	7
	Total	25	53	16	6	30	53	12	5	28	51	16	5	27	52	15	6
g. Your opportunities to make suggestions and influence decisions in your unit?	Academic	32	47	16	5	24	42	23	11	38	40	17	5	31	43	18	8
	Nonacademic	12	49	27	12	17	51	26	6	23	50	21	6	17	49	25	9
	Total	21	48	22	9	22	45	24	9	30	45	19	6	24	46	22	8
h. Your chances of bringing about needed changes in your unit?	Academic	18	50	24	8	13	39	33	15	21	44	28	7	17	44	29	10
	Nonacademic	9	37	38	16	13	44	25	18	14	32	43	11	11	37	37	15
	Total	13	42	32	13	13	41	30	16	17	38	36	9	14	41	33	12

TABLE 3

U. OF I. EMPLOYEES JOB SATISFACTION STUDY

QUESTION 1: ACADEMIC EMPLOYEE GROUPS UNIVERSITY-WIDE

(DATA EXPRESSED AS PERCENTS)

	Academic Employee Group															
	Tenured Faculty				Non-tenured Faculty				Professionals				Graduate Assistants			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Very poor	Very good	Good	Poor	Very poor	Very good	Good	Poor	Very poor	Very good	Good	Poor	Very poor
1. Compared to other jobs like yours or in your field, how would you rate. . .																
a. Your earnings?	5	47	40	8	2	46	40	12	6	58	31	5	13	51	28	8
b. Your prospects for financial security?	8	51	38	3	4	50	35	11	5	50	34	11	7	33	44	16
c. Your prospects for a comfortable retirement?	8	43	40	9	6	49	30	15	7	43	39	11	2	33	33	32
d. Your opportunities for promotion?	13	47	24	16	7	31	31	11	3	26	56	15	3	24	43	30
e. Your opportunities to use your skills and training?	42	45	10	3	43	48	7	2	31	58	10	1	29	56	13	2
f. Your opportunities to control how your job is done?	40	46	10	4	38	51	8	3	31	50	15	4	28	48	19	5
g. Your opportunities to make suggestions and influence decisions in your unit?	35	41	16	8	36	38	19	7	33	48	14	5	19	47	25	9
h. Your chances of bringing about needed changes in your unit?	23	38	27	12	17	46	26	11	19	48	26	7	9	45	35	11

TABLE 4

U. OF I. EMPLOYEES JOB SATISFACTION STUDY

QUESTION 1: NONACADEMIC EMPLOYEES GROUPS UNIVERSITY-WIDE

(DATA EXPRESSED AS PERCENTS)

	Nonacademic Employee Group																			
	Officials and Managers				Professional and Technical				Office and Clerical				Skilled, Semi-Skilled, Unskilled				Service Workers			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Very poor	Very good	Good	Poor	Very poor	Very good	Good	Poor	Very poor	Very good	Good	Poor	Very poor	Very good	Good	Poor	Very poor
1. Compared to other jobs like yours or in your field, how would you rate																				
a. Your earnings?	4	48	44	4	8	44	41	7	4	48	37	11	13	60	22	5	4	64	31	1
b. Your prospects for financial security?	4	60	29	7	10	55	29	6	7	46	35	12	13	65	21	1	2	52	44	2
c. Your prospects for comfortable retirement?	11	52	30	7	8	49	36	7	9	42	34	15	16	55	27	2	7	42	45	6
d. Your opportunities for promotion?	2	21	52	25	2	25	44	29	11	32	36	21	2	25	48	25	4	27	37	32
e. Your opportunities to use your skills and training?	16	60	20	4	22	53	19	6	22	49	19	10	19	66	12	3	12	58	22	8
f. Your opportunities to control how your job is done?	21	49	24	6	26	57	10	7	18	58	18	6	13	56	22	9	23	55	13	9
g. Your opportunities to make suggestions and influence decisions in your unit?	18	55	21	6	20	50	25	5	15	48	26	11	14	50	25	11	16	44	27	13
h. Your chances of bringing about needed changes in your unit?	13	39	37	11	15	46	27	12	11	38	36	15	9	30	41	20	9	28	49	14

TABLE 5

U. OF I. EMPLOYEES JOB SATISFACTION STUDY

QUESTION 2: ACADEMIC VS. NONACADEMIC EMPLOYEES BY CAMPUS

(DATA EXPRESSED AS PERCENTS)

		Urbana-Champaign				Chicago Circle				Medical Center				University-Wide			
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Compared to other jobs like mine or in my field																	
a. My workload here is about the same.	Academic	7	60	22	11	11	63	21	5	9	64	19	8	9	62	21	8
	Nonacademic	4	64	26	6	3	55	34	8	6	67	20	7	4	64	25	7
	Total	5	63	24	8	9	60	25	6	7	65	20	8	7	63	23	7
b. I can advance professionally here.	Academic	11	51	28	10	8	48	30	14	16	63	19	2	11	54	26	9
	Nonacademic	2	23	51	24	4	39	35	22	8	41	39	12	4	32	44	20
	Total	6	35	41	18	6	45	32	17	11	52	30	7	8	43	35	14
c. I can improve my skills here.	Academic	23	69	7	1	14	67	16	3	25	58	16	1	21	65	12	2
	Nonacademic	8	60	24	8	13	66	14	7	13	61	21	5	11	61	21	7
	Total	14	64	17	5	14	67	15	4	19	59	19	3	16	63	17	4
d. I have adequate opportunities for study or research in my field.	Academic	27	51	17	5	18	47	25	10	19	48	27	6	22	48	23	7
	Nonacademic	7	48	34	11	5	56	31	8	9	47	34	10	7	49	33	11
	Total	16	49	27	8	14	50	27	9	14	48	30	8	15	49	28	8
e. I can accomplish most of the things I want to here.	Academic	16	57	23	4	7	50	35	8	16	53	28	3	13	53	29	5
	Nonacademic	5	49	38	8	2	47	38	13	6	56	32	6	5	51	36	8
	Total	10	53	31	6	5	49	36	10	11	54	30	5	9	52	32	7
f. The space and facilities I need to do a good job are available.	Academic	23	53	18	6	16	55	20	9	11	53	28	8	17	54	21	8
	Nonacademic	12	61	22	5	11	53	30	6	7	49	31	13	10	56	26	8
	Total	17	58	20	5	14	55	23	8	9	51	29	11	13	55	24	8
g. The supplies and equipment I need to do a good job are available.	Academic	23	56	16	5	13	62	19	6	14	62	20	4	17	60	18	5
	Nonacademic	18	65	13	4	12	59	21	8	14	57	21	8	16	61	17	6
	Total	20	61	15	4	13	61	19	7	14	60	20	6	16	61	18	5
h. The supporting services I need to do a good job are available.	Academic	18	65	13	4	9	60	24	7	16	56	20	8	14	61	19	6
	Nonacademic	12	77	9	2	8	70	17	5	14	60	22	4	12	70	15	3
	Total	15	72	10	3	9	63	21	7	15	58	21	6	13	65	17	5

TABLE 6

U. OF I. EMPLOYEES JOB SATISFACTION STUDY

QUESTION 2: ACADEMIC EMPLOYEES GROUPS UNIVERSITY-WIDE

(DATA EXPRESSED AS PERCENTS)

	Academic Employee Group															
	Tenured Faculty				Non-Tenured Faculty				Professionals				Graduate Assistants			
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
2. Compared to other jobs like mine or in my field																
a. My workload here is about the same.	15	58	18	9	8	66	16	10	6	56	31	7	7	69	18	6
b. I can advance professionally here.	20	58	17	5	13	60	21	6	6	46	38	10	5	51	29	15
c. I can improve my skill here.	23	60	16	1	23	67	9	1	16	65	14	5	21	68	11	0
d. I have adequate opportunity to study or research in my field here.	22	49	23	6	19	50	26	5	10	46	32	12	38	49	10	3
e. I can accomplish most of the things I want to here.	14	55	26	5	12	58	26	4	6	51	36	7	20	49	26	5
f. The space and facilities I need to do a good job are available.	16	50	25	9	16	53	24	7	15	53	23	9	23	60	12	5
g. The supplies and equipment I need to do a good job are available.	16	57	22	5	15	61	20	4	15	63	16	6	24	58	13	5
h. The supporting services I need to do a good job are available.	11	56	21	12	12	57	24	7	12	65	18	5	23	64	11	2

TABLE 7

U. OF I. EMPLOYEES JOB SATISFACTION STUDY

QUESTION 2: NONACADEMIC EMPLOYEES GROUPS UNIVERSITY-WIDE

(DATA EXPRESSED IN PERCENTS)

	Nonacademic Employee Group																			
	Officials & Managers				Professional & Technical				Office & Clerical				Skilled, Semi-Skilled, & Unskilled				Service Workers			
	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD
2. Compared to other jobs like mine or in my field																				
a. My workload here is about the same.	3	61	31	5	4	68	23	5	4	50	31	15	5	74	18	3	8	61	26	5
b. I can advanced professionally here.	4	34	47	15	2	42	37	19	8	30	38	24	2	27	54	17	7	23	43	27
c. I can improve my skill here.	9	70	18	3	12	66	17	5	17	55	19	9	4	63	27	6	12	46	29	13
d. I have adequate opportunity to study or research in my field here.	3	59	32	6	13	52	27	8	9	47	27	17	2	44	44	10	9	44	35	12
e. I can accomplish most of the things I want to here.	4	48	43	5	5	44	41	10	6	51	30	13	1	62	31	6	11	49	34	6
f. The space and facilities I need to do a good job are available.	8	47	30	15	10	51	30	9	16	58	21	5	8	58	28	6	10	70	17	3
g. The supplies and equipment I need to do a good job are available.	11	67	17	5	14	56	22	8	21	65	11	3	17	62	17	4	14	59	16	11
h. The supporting services I need to do a good job are available.	10	66	19	5	8	70	19	3	18	71	8	3	13	74	11	2	11	67	20	2

TABLE 8

U. OF I. EMPLOYEES JOB SATISFACTION STUDY

QUESTION 3: ACADEMIC VS. NONACADEMIC EMPLOYEES BY CAMPUS

(DATA EXPRESSED AS PERCENTS)

		Urbana-Champaign				Chicago Circle				Medical Center				University-Wide			
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
3. Compared to different jobs in my unit or department																	
a. The importance of my job is well recognized.	Academic	14	58	22	6	15	50	27	8	24	60	15	1	17	56	22	5
	Nonacademic	12	58	24	6	9	67	18	6	20	55	21	4	15	58	22	5
	Total	13	58	23	6	13	55	24	8	22	57	18	3	16	57	22	5
b. I get full credit for the work I do.	Academic	16	56	24	4	15	53	25	7	25	62	11	2	18	57	20	5
	Nonacademic	12	54	30	4	13	60	21	6	18	55	24	3	14	55	27	4
	Total	14	55	27	4	14	55	24	7	21	58	18	3	16	56	24	4
c. I am proud of the work I do.	Academic	40	56	4	0	39	57	4	0	49	47	4	0	42	54	4	0
	Nonacademic	28	66	6	0	38	57	5	0	39	56	5	0	34	61	5	0
	Total	33	62	5	0	39	57	4	0	44	52	4	0	37	58	5	0
d. I like the work I do.	Academic	41	54	5	0	42	52	6	0	51	44	5	0	44	51	5	0
	Nonacademic	28	65	7	0	35	56	6	3	34	58	7	1	31	61	7	1
	Total	33	60	7	0	40	54	5	1	42	51	6	1	38	55	6	1
e. I feel important here.	Academic	18	52	27	3	12	52	28	8	26	51	21	2	18	52	25	5
	Nonacademic	13	48	32	7	6	57	28	9	18	55	23	4	14	52	28	6
	Total	15	50	30	5	10	54	28	8	22	53	22	3	16	52	27	5
f. I feel needed here.	Academic	19	55	21	5	17	51	25	7	32	51	15	2	22	53	20	5
	Nonacademic	17	60	19	4	8	70	14	8	19	61	16	4	16	62	17	5
	Total	18	58	20	4	15	57	21	7	25	56	16	3	19	57	19	5
g. I feel liked here.	Academic	25	66	8	1	22	67	9	2	29	68	3	0	25	67	7	1
	Nonacademic	18	76	4	2	13	75	12	0	26	66	7	1	20	72	7	1
	Total	21	72	6	1	19	70	10	1	27	67	5	1	23	69	7	1
h. I feel respected here.	Academic	24	60	14	2	20	59	18	3	31	60	8	1	25	59	14	2
	Nonacademic	15	70	12	3	9	75	13	3	22	65	10	3	17	69	11	3
	Total	19	65	13	3	17	64	16	3	27	62	9	2	21	64	12	3

TABLE 9

U. OF I. EMPLOYEES JOB SATISFACTION STUDY

QUESTION 3: ACADEMIC EMPLOYEE GROUPS UNIVERSITY-WIDE

(DATA EXPRESSED AS PERCENTS)

	Academic Employee Group															
	Tenured Faculty				Non-Tenured Faculty				Professionals				Graduate Assistants			
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Compared to different jobs in my unit or department																
a. The importance of my job is well recognized.	26	51	18	5	19	59	18	4	15	56	23	6	10	57	28	5
b. I get full credit for the work I do.	24	47	23	6	23	53	18	6	16	59	21	4	9	70	19	2
c. I am proud of the work I do.	52	44	3	1	51	45	4	0	41	56	3	0	21	74	5	0
d. I like the work I do.	56	40	4	0	49	48	2	1	43	51	6	0	26	64	10	0
e. I feel important here.	26	51	18	5	19	56	20	5	16	51	29	4	10	48	37	5
f. I feel needed here.	30	49	16	5	24	55	16	5	22	53	22	3	11	54	30	5
g. I feel liked here.	29	62	8	1	24	67	8	1	23	70	6	1	24	69	6	1
h. I feel respected here.	33	54	10	3	25	59	14	2	22	64	13	1	18	60	18	4

TABLE 10

U. OF I. EMPLOYEES JOB SATISFACTION STUDY

QUESTION 3: NONACADEMIC EMPLOYEE GROUPS UNIVERSITY-WIDE

(DATA EXPRESSED AS PERCENTS)

	Officials & Managers				Professional & Technical				Office & Clerical				Skilled, Semi-Skilled, & Unskilled				Service Workers			
	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD
3. Compared to different jobs in my unit or department																				
a. The importance of my job is well recognized.	11	55	27	7	12	69	15	4	17	52	25	6	17	56	22	5	17	56	20	7
b. I get full credit for the work I do.	11	54	33	2	14	58	24	4	15	52	28	5	14	57	23	6	20	52	24	4
c. I am proud of the work I do.	29	69	2	0	33	60	7	0	35	53	11	1	38	62	0	0	30	62	8	0
d. I like the work I do.	30	67	3	0	29	63	7	1	36	47	15	2	33	65	2	0	26	63	10	1
e. I feel important here.	13	57	27	3	10	56	26	8	16	45	32	7	13	52	29	6	18	47	27	8
f. I feel needed here.	13	64	19	4	14	63	19	4	21	56	18	5	12	64	18	6	22	64	9	5
g. I feel liked here.	17	77	6	0	19	74	7	0	26	65	8	1	18	75	5	2	22	70	4	4
h. I feel respected here.	16	74	10	0	13	72	12	3	22	62	15	1	19	66	12	3	15	72	7	6

TABLE 11

U. OF I. EMPLOYEES JOB SATISFACTION STUDY

QUESTIONS 4 AND 5: ACADEMIC VS. NONACADEMIC EMPLOYEES BY CAMPUS

(DATA EXPRESSED AS PERCENTS)

		Urbana-Champaign				Chicago Circle				Medical Center				University-wide			
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Most of my co-workers here are																	
a. Intelligent	Academic	47	50	3	0	35	61	4	0	40	57	2	1	41	56	3	0
	Nonacademic	19	76	4	1	23	62	11	4	25	65	8	2	22	70	6	2
	Total	31	65	3	1	31	61	6	2	32	61	5	2	31	63	5	1
b. Friendly	Academic	36	60	4	0	33	58	7	2	34	59	5	2	34	59	6	1
	Nonacademic	25	73	2	0	22	68	8	2	30	65	4	1	26	69	4	1
	Total	29	68	3	0	29	61	8	2	32	62	5	1	30	64	5	1
c. Competent	Academic	35	59	6	0	28	59	12	1	31	61	6	2	31	60	8	1
	Nonacademic	19	71	10	0	15	59	24	2	22	65	12	1	19	67	13	1
	Total	26	66	8	0	24	59	16	1	26	63	10	1	25	64	10	1
d. Cooperative	Academic	31	60	8	1	26	59	14	1	29	61	9	1	29	60	10	1
	Nonacademic	22	67	9	2	14	67	19	0	24	65	10	1	21	67	11	1
	Total	26	64	9	1	22	62	15	1	26	63	10	1	25	63	11	1
My boss (chairman, supervisor, etc.) here is . . .																	
a. Honest	Academic	50	41	6	3	49	38	9	4	56	39	3	2	52	39	6	3
	Nonacademic	37	54	7	3	48	41	7	4	42	49	7	2	40	50	7	3
	Total	42	48	7	3	49	39	8	4	49	44	5	2	46	44	7	3
b. Fair	Academic	46	41	10	3	41	40	12	7	46	44	8	2	44	42	10	4
	Nonacademic	29	53	14	4	35	45	17	3	33	52	14	1	31	51	15	3
	Total	36	48	12	4	39	41	14	6	39	48	11	2	38	46	12	4
c. Competent	Academic	47	42	8	3	43	40	11	6	49	41	8	2	46	41	9	4
	Nonacademic	34	52	12	2	40	49	8	3	39	51	8	2	36	51	10	3
	Total	39	48	10	3	42	43	10	5	44	46	8	2	42	46	9	3
d. Cooperative	Academic	45	43	9	3	43	42	11	4	47	43	8	2	45	43	9	3
	Nonacademic	29	57	11	3	36	52	10	2	35	51	12	2	32	54	11	3
	Total	36	51	10	3	41	45	11	3	41	47	10	2	39	48	10	3

TABLE 12

U. OF I. EMPLOYEES JOB SATISFACTION STUDY

QUESTIONS 4 AND 5: ACADEMIC EMPLOYEES GROUPS UNIVERSITY-WIDE

(DATA EXPRESSED AS PERCENTS)

	Academic Employee Group															
	Tenured Faculty				Non-tenured Faculty				Professionals				Graduate Assistants			
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Most of my co-workers here are																
a. Intelligent	46	50	3	1	42	54	4	0	35	63	2	0	39	57	4	0
b. Friendly	33	60	5	2	35	56	8	1	35	61	4	0	34	59	5	2
c. Competent	33	57	8	2	33	57	9	1	30	62	8	0	30	62	8	0
d. Cooperative	28	60	10	2	29	58	12	1	29	62	8	1	28	61	10	1
My boss (Chairman, Supervisor, etc.) here is . . .																
a. Honest	51	38	7	4	51	39	6	4	50	40	8	2	54	39	4	3
b. Fair	43	41	11	5	46	40	9	5	42	42	13	3	47	45	6	2
c. Competent	45	41	9	5	46	40	10	4	43	41	11	5	52	43	4	1
d. Cooperative	43	41	11	5	46	43	9	2	45	40	10	5	45	46	7	2

TABLE 13

U. OF I. EMPLOYEES JOB SATISFACTION STUDY

QUESTIONS 4 AND 5: NONACADEMIC EMPLOYEES GROUPS UNIVERSITY-WIDE

(DATA EXPRESSED AS PERCENTS)

	Nonacademic Employee Group																			
	Officials & Managers				Professional & Technical				Office & Clerical				Skilled, Semi-Skilled, & Unskilled				Service Workers			
	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD
4. Most of my co-workers here are																				
a. Intelligent	22	73	4	1	26	65	9	0	27	62	7	4	17	78	4	1	16	71	9	4
b. Friendly	24	71	4	1	27	71	1	1	28	65	7	0	23	73	4	0	28	68	3	1
c. Competent	15	69	16	0	21	64	15	0	22	61	15	2	20	71	9	0	17	76	6	1
d. Cooperative	18	70	11	1	22	65	12	1	26	61	12	1	21	69	9	1	17	71	11	1
5. My boss (Chairman, Supervisor, etc.) here is . . .																				
a. Honest	37	53	7	3	42	50	6	2	43	47	7	3	38	53	7	2	42	46	7	5
b. Fair	27	55	16	2	34	49	15	2	35	43	19	3	25	60	11	4	38	47	10	5
c. Competent	33	52	13	2	38	49	11	2	46	45	7	2	29	58	9	4	38	51	10	1
d. Cooperative	27	59	12	2	30	60	9	1	44	40	14	2	25	59	11	5	35	53	10	2

TABLE 14

U. OF I. EMPLOYEES JOB SATISFACTION STUDY

QUESTIONS 6, 7a, AND 7b: ACADEMIC VS. NONACADEMIC EMPLOYEES BY CAMPUS

(DATA EXPRESSED AS PERCENTS)

		Campus															
		Urbana-Champaign				Chicago Circle				Medical Center				University-wide			
		Very Adequate	Adeq.	Inadeq.	Very Inadeq.	Very Adequate	Adeq.	Inadeq.	Very Inadeq.	Very Adequate	Adeq.	Inadeq.	Very Inadeq.	Very Adequate	Adeq.	Inadeq.	Very Inadeq.
In general, do you think that the information you receive from newsletters, bulletin boards, and bulletins about things related to the job (retirement, fringe benefits, etc.) is . . .	Academic	15	62	16	7	9	65	21	5	20	66	11	3	14	64	17	5
	Nonacademic	25	62	11	2	14	60	19	7	18	57	20	5	21	60	15	4
	Total	21	62	13	4	10	63	21	6	19	61	16	4	17	62	16	5
		Univ. of Illinois	Somewhere Else	Wouldn't Work		Univ. of Illinois	Somewhere Else	Wouldn't Work		Univ. of Illinois	Somewhere Else	Wouldn't Work		Univ. of Illinois	Somewhere Else	Wouldn't Work	
. If you really had a choice, would you prefer to work at the University of Illinois or somewhere else?	Academic	62	35	3		53	46	1		71	28	1		62	36	2	
	Nonacademic	79	18	3		64	34	2		84	15	1		78	20	2	
	Total	72	25	3		56	42	2		78	21	1		70	28	2	
		Same Kind of Job	Different Kind of Job	Wouldn't Work		Same Kind of Job	Different Kind of Job	Wouldn't Work		Same Kind of Job	Different Kind of Job	Wouldn't Work		Same Kind of Job	Different Kind of Job	Wouldn't Work	
. If you really had a choice, would you prefer the same kind of job you now have or a different kind of job?	Academic	71	28	1		75	24	1		76	23	1		74	25	1	
	Nonacademic	67	31	2		63	36	1		69	30	1		67	32	1	
	Total	68	30	2		71	28	1		72	27	1		70	29	1	

TABLE 15

U. OF I. EMPLOYEES JOB SATISFACTION STUDY

QUESTIONS 6, 7a, AND 7b: ACADEMIC EMPLOYEES GROUPS UNIVERSITY-WIDE

(DATA EXPRESSED AS PERCENTS)

	Academic Employee Group															
	Tenured Faculty				Non-tenured faculty				Professionals				Graduate Assistants			
	Very Adequate	Adeq.	Inadeq.	Very Inadeq.	Very Adequate	Adeq.	Inadeq.	Very Inadeq.	Very Adequate	Adeq.	Inadeq.	Very Inadeq.	Very Adequate	Adeq.	Inadeq.	Very Inadeq.
In general, do you think that the information you receive from newsletters, bulletin boards, and bulletins about things related to the job (retirement, fringe benefits, etc.) is . . .	20	64	13	3	17	63	15	5	13	66	17	4	6	64	22	8
	Univ. of Illinois	Somewhere Else	Wouldn't Work		Univ. of Illinois	Somewhere Else	Wouldn't Work		Univ. of Illinois	Somewhere Else	Wouldn't Work		Univ. of Illinois	Somewhere Else	Wouldn't Work	
If you really had a choice, would you prefer to work at the University of Illinois or somewhere else?	60	39	1		60	38	2		70	28	2		57	42	1	
	Same Kind of Job	Different Kind of Job	Wouldn't Work		Same Kind of Job	Different Kind of Job	Wouldn't Work		Same Kind of Job	Different Kind of Job	Wouldn't Work		Same Kind of Job	Different Kind of Job	Wouldn't Work	
If you really had a choice, would you prefer the same kind of job you now have or a different kind of job?	89	10	1		81	19	0		75	24	1		46	53	1	

TABLE 16

U. OF I. EMPLOYEES JOB SATISFACTION STUDY

QUESTIONS 6, 7a, AND 7b: NONACADEMIC EMPLOYEES GROUPS UNIVERSITY-WIDE

(DATA EXPRESSED AS PERCENTS)

	Nonacademic Employee Group																			
	Officials and Managers				Professional and Technical				Office and Clerical				Skilled Semi-skilled and Unskilled				Service Workers			
	Very Adeq.	Adeq.	Inad.	Very Inad.	Very Adeq.	Adeq.	Inad.	Very Inad.	Very Adeq.	Adeq.	Inad.	Very Inad.	Very Adeq.	Adeq.	Inad.	Very Inad.	Very Adeq.	Adeq.	Inad.	Very Inad.
In general, do you think that the information you receive from newsletters, bulletin boards, and bulletins about things related to the job (retirement, fringe benefits, etc.) is . . .	14	63	18	5	19	62	15	4	23	61	13	3	26	59	12	3	21	53	22	4
	Univ. of Ill.	Somewhere Else	Wouldn't Work		Univ. of Ill.	Somewhere Else	Wouldn't Work		Univ. of Ill.	Somewhere Else	Wouldn't Work		Univ. of Ill.	Somewhere Else	Wouldn't Work		Univ. of Ill.	Somewhere Else	Wouldn't Work	
If you really had a choice, would you prefer to work at the University of Illinois or somewhere else?	80	18	2		71	25	4		68	29	3		87	12	1		86	13	1	
	Same Kind of Job	Diff. Kind of Job	Wouldn't Work		Same Kind of Job	Diff. Kind of Job	Wouldn't Work		Same Kind of Job	Diff. Kind of Job	Wouldn't Work		Same Kind of Job	Diff. Kind of Job	Wouldn't Work		Same Kind of Job	Diff. Kind of Job	Wouldn't Work	
If you really had a choice, would you prefer the same kind of job you now have or a different kind of job?	75	24	1		63	34	3		56	42	2		83	17	0		48	51	1	